

September 28, 1966

23226

The South Vietnamese trooper here is a tougher, newer breed. He is trained, committed to action, then retrained. He is indoctrinated. He's 17 to 24 years old, small, stoic, resilient, with the faculty of surviving in the harsh, humid climate of the Delta. When mounting up for an operation he does not hang back, but hops into an aircraft with verve. He is confident of winning.

"I have yet to see a wounded ARVN soldier whimper," comments one veteran U.S. adviser. "He lies quietly, awaiting treatment and evacuation. He knows people care about him."

Leadership is improving. ARVN officers are now where the fighting is. Watch them in action, and you are not surprised that their casualties run high.

"AN ENTIRELY NEW ARMY"

Still, there is room for improvement. One American adviser makes this point: "The gap in generations is clear. The older South Vietnamese officers are very interested in protecting their spheres of command so they can govern. They think nothing of embezzling. They hold down talented young officers. But these youngsters are selfless and motivated. They will form an entirely new Army in about five years."

Another headache is the Vietnamese habit of going absent without leave when the mood strikes. Most soldiers intend to return to their outfits, but only half actually do. Virtually none go over to the Viet Cong. The net loss to ARVN units in the Delta is 500 men a month. Another 800 drop out of the regional and popular forces. As of now, new recruiting exceeds those losses.

You still hear stories of Government soldiers "bugging out" at critical moments. Col. George A. Barten, 50, the top U.S. adviser until last month, reports: "Most remarks critical of the ARVN troops in the Delta are made in the shock and the heat of battle. Man for man, if properly led and trained, they're as good as our GIs or the South Koreans here. Those Koreans have the best of the crack units. But remember the slighting remarks we used to make about them during the Korean War?"

Colonel Desobry adds: "Our junior officers do most of the criticizing. But they don't see the whole picture. I've watched ARVN troops advance against mines, grenade traps and automatic fire. That takes guts of the highest order. Sometimes it's fantastic. And the ARVN does it every day."

Viet Cong strength in the Delta is about the same as a year ago, although the Viet Cong forces are suffering losses of 1,000 killed and 1,500 desertions per month. Full-time guerrilla forces total 30,000 men in 22 battalions, backed by 30,000 political cadres and part-time guerrillas.

RED MORALE: DROPPING

Communist officers remain dedicated and highly motivated. But morale has dropped in the ranks because of the high casualties and the lack of victories. The Viet Cong no longer is getting eager volunteers, and must now resort to a draft that amounts to kidnaping. Boys of 14 to 16 have been found in action.

Battlefield morale is sagging. Take the once-dreaded Tay Do battalion of the Viet Cong. It has been badly mauled enough to have been reconstituted twice in eight months. Today, the South Vietnamese are anxious to take them on.

This is the analysis of top U.S. advisers in this area:

Virtually by themselves, the South Vietnamese in the Delta have turned a losing proposition into a winning one. They have been proving they have both the will and ability to win. The offensive spirit has taken a firm hold.

While bringing more U.S. troops into the Delta might speed things up, that is not

what the Vietnamese want. They'd prefer more training for their local forces, more arms for all, and more helicopters for their ARVN regulars. They want to fight this battle themselves.

For all concerned, all this adds up to a big plus in one vital area of South Vietnam.

MINORITY VIEWS OF THE WAR ON POVERTY LEGISLATION

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966 debate in the House is very much in the news these days, and the pros and cons of this war on poverty legislation is currently an important issue. In the American tradition, both sides of the issue should be taken into consideration before judgment is passed. The opposition's position has been a matter of public record since June of this year when the minority views of the House Education and Labor Committee were published. To provide a more complete background for evaluating this legislation, I have requested that the minority views be placed in the RECORD at this point, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

We, the undersigned, oppose this legislation because it merely repeats the high promises to the poor and raises their expectations without providing the effective means of fulfilling them. Specifically, we oppose this legislation because it does not address itself to—

1. The correction of the abuses which are destroying the poverty program; or
2. The guarantee of involvement of local government officials and citizens of talent with representatives of the poor at policy-making levels to provide the indispensable ingredient of success for community action programs; or
3. The establishment of a partnership with the States which will allow them meaningful participation in the program; or
4. The establishment of program and funding priorities which would give emphasis to the needs of the very young and training opportunities in private enterprise to the unemployed.

FROM BAD TO WORSE

During the past year, efforts by the Education and Labor Committee to gather information which would be helpful in drafting effective antipoverty legislation have fallen far short of the desired goal. A \$200,000 investigation was thwarted by lack of direction and tactics resulting in a most superficial effort. To date, no report has been published of the findings of the investigation.

The promises of an in-depth study of the war on poverty and subsequent hearings in selected field areas were totally unfulfilled. The minority membership, available during the November-January period of adjournment, waited patiently for field hearings which never materialized.

A musical chair investigative staff, which at no time included an accountant, was constantly confused by change of directions, canceled trips, recall from investigations, and numerous changes in the lineup. Reports were sketchy and for the most part consisted of statistics and percentages which provided little help to draft sorely needed legislative changes. In December the chairman astonished subcommittee members by appointing

a three-man task force to "check on" his first investigation.

No independent investigation was possible under these circumstances

The widely heralded hearings of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the War on Poverty in March developed into an 8-day parade of administration spokesmen and apologists for the poverty program who spent hours relating self-serving statistics and stressing debatable accomplishments. The hearings were so loaded that the most critical witness turned out to be the Director, Sargent Shriver, himself.

The minority recommended 67 witnesses, knowledgeable regarding all aspects of the antipoverty program, be called. These recommendations were ignored and the hearings were abruptly terminated. When incredulous Republican committee members, and the press, questioned Chairman POWELL's arbitrary action, his response was characteristic: "Because I am the Chairman."

The private wedding of politics and poverty

Perpetrating one of the sorriest exhibitions of political partisanship involving a piece of important national legislation that the Congress has ever witnessed, committee Democrats held a series of private caucuses to draft the Economic Opportunity Act amendments. Excluding Republicans from the closed-door sessions, the Democrats sought to write "a bill we can defend."

In our opinion these actions are an open admission that many Democrats consider the poverty program as pure politics and their own private preserve.

Forty-one days after the abrupt termination of hearings, executive sessions to mark up the bill were begun. The more than a month that the Democrats spent in an effort to hammer out a position which they could defend was apparently of no avail. Any discussion of issues quickly revealed their serious divisions. Several times executive sessions broke up in confusion as Democrats repeatedly caucused in an effort to unite in a defensive position.

Whip cracks

When it became apparent that there was still serious dissension among the Democratic members, the chairman ramrodded the bill through the committee rather than have it subjected to amendments. Republican proposals for substantial changes that would have corrected present abuses in the program were summarily rejected on straight party-line votes.

Thus, as the war on poverty approaches its third year, with abuses, scandals, and waste mounting, no significant corrective changes have been made in the legislation. Now, more than ever, there is a critical need for a responsible and sincere investigation of the program. Numerous instances of waste and corruption have been exposed, for the most part by diligent newspaper reporters in various localities. But this is not enough. There is a notable lack of inspections and examinations of expenditures.

Rules Committee refuses to hold hearings

Congressman WILLIAM H. AYRES, joined by other Republicans, sponsored a resolution to establish a select committee of the House, appointed by the Speaker with the advice of the minority leader, to conduct a thorough and bipartisan investigation of the structure and operation of the Economic Opportunity Act. Although this proposal has had overwhelming support from Republicans and has been sponsored by some Democrats—notably Judiciary Committee Chairman EMANUEL CELLER—the controlling members of the Rules Committee have refused to even hold a hearing on the resolution for a select committee.

Although undermanned, we will continue to survey the poverty program, to point out the abuses, and to make proposals for constructive changes.

public servants might be long-term leaves of absence and accelerated securing of tenure.

Mr. Speaker, I see in this area a chance to make many Federal programs which depend on local implementation more effective and efficient and, at the same time, to help all levels of government improve their performance on all programs.

A BRIGHT SPOT IN THE VIETNAMESE WAR

(Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. DINGELL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last, I had occasion in this House to express the hope that the administration would not send U.S. troops into the Mekong Delta area in South Vietnam where there are no North Vietnamese troops and where, until now, the South Vietnamese Army has been apparently doing reasonably well.

Recently the Embassy of the Republic of Vietnam in Washington sent out a variety of materials, including an article from U.S. News & World Report of July 11, 1966. This article was headlined "A Bright Spot in the Vietnamese War" and was preceded by the following summary in bold type:

While war elsewhere dominates the headlines, in the Mekong Delta some quiet gains are being made against the Reds. More than that: the South Vietnamese are doing the job themselves, with little direct military help from the U.S.

The article states that "the South Vietnamese in the delta have turned a losing proposition into a winning one," and that "while bringing more U.S. troops into the delta might speed things up, that is not what the Vietnamese want."

The text of the article from U.S. News & World Report follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, July 11, 1966]

PHONG DINH PROVINCE.—Here in the lush Mekong Delta, all but lost 18 months ago, the South Vietnamese Army has turned the tables and—with a minimum of U.S. aid—is giving the Communists a severe drubbing.

So far this year, more than 2,500 Viet Cong—equal to five Red battalions—have deserted to Government forces.

This is just one sign of progress. Saigon's "pacification program" has also been making measurable headway in the Delta region.

Eighteen months ago, only 36 per cent of the Delta population, living in 1,100 of the 4,000 hamlet areas, was under shaky Government control.

Now, more than 55 per cent of the people, in 1,884 hamlets and working more than half the productive land, are living in relatively "secure" parts of the Delta, only occasionally harassed by terrorists. Another 20 per cent are in Provinces undergoing clearance. The rest—roughly 1.3 million people—remain under Communist control.

Although the turnaround in the Delta has been overshadowed by military actions farther to the north, it has far-reaching implications.

RICE-BOWL COUNTRY

The Delta is rich, both in food and in manpower. Altogether, 5.5 million people live along the Mekong and Bassac rivers and interconnecting canals, and near the soggy Plain of Reeds and coastal mangrove swamps and marshes.

This is the country's rice bowl. For many years the Viet Cong have used the Delta as a source of rice, money, consumer goods and men. If the Reds can be deprived of the Delta's riches, their efforts to win will be badly crippled.

No one expects the Viet Cong to be knocked out overnight. In fact, the Government still is having plenty of trouble moving rice from its own areas to hungry markets in Saigon and elsewhere.

But consider what the South Vietnamese troops have been doing here with the help of 1,800 U.S. advisers and two small combat-support units—some 4,500 Americans in all.

Last month alone, South Vietnamese units of the Fourth Corps started 37,000 small-unit actions and 24 air-mobile operations, killing more than 1,800 Viet Cong and capturing tons of equipment. The kill ratio, which once favored Government forces by 3 to 1, now has improved to 4 to 1.

The Viet Cong are now found to be backing off from Government attempts at sustained battalion and regimental-size actions, having realized their vulnerability in open Delta country. But that hasn't stopped the action. The means to find and force the Reds to fight has been skillfully developed.

Says a top officer at Fourth Corps headquarters: "We have the initiative. The Viet Cong still set ambushes—some very clever ones—but we use mobility and firepower to isolate them, gain superiority of numbers and then destroy them with hammer-and-anvil tactics."

The big problem here is no longer purely military, but aligning the military and civil efforts in the pacification program.

There is money enough available, thanks to the U.S., and troops enough, thanks to Saigon. But there is a severe shortage of cadres, the skilled, hard-core experts needed to make the program work.

Military commanders feel they can "liberate" more than 600 Viet Cong hamlets this year, but a new 13-week course to train cadres, now in operation, will provide enough Government teams for no more than 300 hamlets. That puts a ceiling on what can be done.

HOW IT WORKS

Each hamlet of 2,000 people that is won from the enemy requires a static defense to guard it from counterattack, and a 59-man pacification team. The team combines skills in construction, psychological warfare and a broad range of civic action.

The team must take a census, recruit a local paramilitary force, set up defense obstacles and communications systems, organize the people into units with specific tasks, appoint a governing committee for the hamlet, and root out the remains of Viet Cong influence.

The program is well under way, after months and years of delay. The Americans are deeply involved. You see them everywhere, working with their Vietnamese counterparts. They are U.S. Army advisers, or representatives of the Joint U.S. Public

Affairs office, the AID program, Catholic Relief Service and other voluntary organizations.

These Americans are working hard at land reform, and projects in education, social welfare, public works, administration, police, postal system and health. Direct U.S. aid for these projects ranges from office equipment, cameras and generators to barges, motor scooters, trucks and bulldozers.

Since the first of this year, Americans in the Delta have distributed 9,000 tons of relief goods and helped build 49 new schools, 80 classroom additions, 28 marketplaces, 69 bridges, 13 water-purification systems and 14 dispensaries.

While work goes on in the villages, South Vietnamese troops have been clearing large stretches of Arterial Highway 4, which snakes 280 miles across the Delta from Saigon to the southernmost parts of Camau Peninsula.

Talk is heard here from time to time that a division of American or South Korean troops will soon be arriving to help break the two-decade Communist grip on the Delta. But South Vietnamese commanders say that is not likely, because their own forces are doing well enough on their own. They would not particularly welcome "outside" troops—and many Americans, for their part, are not keen on "Delta duty."

Says one U.S. military adviser: "The big problem is not knocking off the Viet Cong in any particular sector, but having to leave battalions behind to provide constant security. That is the kind of static warfare—you might just as well call it guard duty—the local recruits ought to be doing, not American combat battalions. No, the need is not for Americans, but for more regional and popular forces and more troop lift to ferry the South Vietnamese regulars around."

Lieut. Gen. Dang Van Quang, 43, the Delta-born commander of the Fourth Corps, emphasizes: "We still don't have enough helicopters for proper mobile operations. They keep promising and promising in Saigon. Just words. So I cannot do as I like. With more helicopters I could further increase my operations."

During the past year the regular forces—called ARVN, for Army of the Republic of Viet Nam—have grown by 25 per cent in the Fourth Corps area. Mobility and firepower have nearly doubled. Revitalized ARVN forces now total 43,000 men in the Seventh, Ninth and Twenty-first divisions and 4 Ranger battalions, 2 artillery battalions and 3 armored regiments.

Behind the ARVN are the expanding regional forces with 44,000 men, organized into 247 companies; 55,000 men in the popular forces guarding hamlets and manning outposts; 10,000 national policemen, and 3,000 airmen and sailors.

The 1,800 U.S. military advisers in the Delta—500 more than a year ago—are considered the most skilled American fighting men assigned to any one battle area. Another 2,700 U.S. Army and Navy men are serving in two combat-support units: the Thirteenth Aviation Battalion, with 70 helicopters and transports, and Task Force 116/2, with several divisions of river-patrol craft.

Col. William R. Desobry, 47, senior Army adviser in the Fourth Corps, says of his men: "I was at Bastogne. But when I compare what we had there with the Americans that we have here, those here come out way ahead."

A TOUGHER BREED

You cannot miss the respect that U.S. advisers and Vietnamese troops have for each other.

Now we are asked to pay more money for more mismanagement. I can find no safeguards against waste and mismanagement in this bill; I can find no correctives for the many abuses which have been brought to light.

I have a duty to speak for both the have's and the have not's in opposing this measure. Nothing has aroused the workingman more this year than to learn that his hard-earned money is passed out lavishly to no effective end. Nothing has disappointed the poor people of this country more than to be told a billion dollars would be spent to relieve their distress and then to find that most of the money went into the pockets of bureaucrats and people of influence rather than into the hands of the truly deserving.

I am convinced that one of the greatest poverty areas in the country is to be found in the administration of this program. There are alternatives. There are programs already provided for by law which will do much of what this program promised to do. With what we know of the nature and cause of economic distress in various areas of our country, we can devise new programs which can help our poor people, and I am ready to support a proper program that promises to be effective.

This program is not the only answer to poverty; it is not even a good answer. To continue this sort of thing will prevent development of a measure which will work, and on that basis, I ask the Members to join me in defeating this bill.

CINCINNATI COMBATS CRIME

(Mr. CLANCY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the formation last week by the Cincinnati City Council of a special committee on crime. Proposed by Councilman John Held, the creation of this committee was unanimously approved by the Cincinnati City Council.

Its purpose is to conduct an immediate detailed and in-depth investigation and analysis of all aspects of public safety in Cincinnati, with special emphasis on the prevalence and increase of crimes of violence and of traffic law violations. This is the first time that a local government has launched an investigation of crime in such depth, and I heartily support and commend the move.

Public hearings are scheduled to begin on October 7, and, at the conclusion of the hearings, the committee will present its findings and recommendations for corrective measures to the full council. Experts in all fields of public safety will be called upon to testify, beginning with Cincinnati Safety Director Henry Sandman.

Due to its competent and efficient police force, Cincinnati has been relatively free of violent crime and gang warfare in the past. However, recent figures show that criminal offenses against persons in

Cincinnati increased 14.4 percent for the first 8 months of this year compared with the same period in 1965. Furthermore, total major crimes in all categories show an overall increase of 10.8 percent for the first 8 months of 1966.

It is clear that the increase of crime in our metropolitan areas is fast reaching emergency proportions, and the Cincinnati City Council is to be congratulated for supplementing concern over the rising crime rate with prompt action aimed at substantially reducing the number of crimes committed. The formation of the special crime committee is proof that Cincinnati will not tolerate large-scale crime and readily accepts the responsibility of insuring the safety of her citizens. It is my hope that other cities will follow the fine example set by Cincinnati and initiate similar studies.

I am inserting in the Record a particularly enlightening editorial which appeared in the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star on Wednesday, September 21, 1966, entitled "We Must Keep This A Safe City." I would also like to include a September 24 article by Sharon Moloney from the same newspaper describing vividly the concern of Greater Cincinnatians over crimes of violence and relating the appalling experiences of several individuals.

I have arranged a meeting tomorrow between the FBI, members of the committee and other interested citizens. I urge the cooperation of all law enforcement agencies in Hamilton County in the forthcoming investigation and respectfully request that they too join in seeking the advice and counsel of the FBI.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Cincinnati Post & Times-Star, Sept. 21, 1966]

WE MUST KEEP THIS A SAFE CITY

The Cincinnati we know has been a city where the average citizen has felt safe going about his business, at his home or on the streets.

We have had spectacular crimes, of course, but never has there been any widespread feeling of insecurity, or fear that anyone of us might be pounced upon by hoodlums in the streets. The usual burglaries or stickups occurred in the past, but not the kind of mugging and acts of senseless violence and vandalism that are happening now.

And such crimes, whether by two or six or a crowd, are occurring at an alarming rate, as every newspaper reader knows. The penalties slapped upon the hoodlums by the local courts have been heavy. These penalties undoubtedly have put the fear of the law into some—but the violence goes on.

Councilman Held proposes that we try harder, that we use our wits to find more effective methods and, when those methods are adopted, to back the law with citizen cooperation (getting involved) and a willingness to pay more tax money for our safety.

Nobody likes the thought of paying more taxes, but if we do not guarantee reasonable security of life and property in our community, we have failed in the first purpose of government.

This city has been generally free of organized crime and gang warfare, thanks to an efficient police force and a strong public opinion that did not believe a city should tolerate a "criminal area" any more than it should tolerate a 10 per cent rake-off to get things done by City Hall.

Whatever steps the city and its police take in an accelerated effort to crack down on the

breed of criminals who attack on the street and break into homes, these steps are not likely to work overnight miracles.

We see no reason for pushing a panic button. We see every reason for giving safety of the people real priority with determination to stop this hoodlumism before it "takes charge" of the city.

There will be crime until we get the perfect society, but this community must not, and will not, let the hoodlums run wild. We have had reasonable security of our persons and homes. We do not want to be in such a state of fear that we cower behind locked doors at night, afraid to step out after sundown.

Let's make up our minds now that's not the way it is going to be, whatever the cost in money or in our time and our co-operation.

[From the Cincinnati Post & Times-Star, Sept. 24, 1966]

MANY LETTERS DESCRIBE STREET TERROR—RESIDENTS SAY COURTS TOO EASY ON TEEN GANGS

(By Sharon Moloney)

A Cincinnati woman describes how she frantically ran red lights to attract help during a terrifying, high-speed chase by a carload of young thugs.

Another tell show she was terrorized by a gang of teenagers who surrounded her car and began rocking and beating it.

A third said her seventh grade son narrowly escaped injury, and possible death, when somebody shot at his school bus.

"It broke two windows," the boy said, "and the bullet went right past my face."

"Dear God, this boy is mine," the woman wrote in a letter to Councilman John Held and the city's crime committee. "He is rough and tough; a student and a nice kid. Please protect him. I will gladly send him on canoe trips, shooting rapids for 200 miles and let him learn to be a man . . . let him play football and take his lumps with proper equipment."

"But do I have to pray he won't get killed at school?"

The woman is one of scores of individual Cincinnatians who have written in their firm support of Council's crime investigation and Councilman Held's proposal for an "all out war on crimes of violence."

The letters have come from all over the city. They describe muggings, beatings and gang violence in the streets from Price Hill and Western Hills to Avondale and Hyde Park.

The letters make it plain that Cincinnatians are deeply concerned with rising crime and violence. And they are angry. They are fed up with what they believe is too lenient treatment of law breakers. Almost without exception, they call for stronger laws, stronger enforcement and stronger punishment—particularly in the cases of juveniles.

"The current idea that police and public 'can't touch me—I'm a juvenile'—has to be changed," one man wrote. "As long as they run around in packs and carry knives and chains and beat up on innocent people, it's time that this be changed so someone can touch them—but good."

People recommended harsher punishment for juveniles—from permitting teachers to spank students to providing stiffer jail terms, and fewer probations. Several recommended fines for parents of delinquents.

One man suggested a strong new law directed specifically at youth gang violence and providing for "severe punishment for the ones involved in second or third assaults and destruction of property. Treating them as individual juveniles, with a scolding, doesn't seem to be the answer."

The letter writers without exception sympathized with police, favored more and higher-paid police officers and heaped most of

the blame for the crime increase on Supreme Court decisions which "have shackled police," too lenient judges and even lawyers.

"If a policeman so much as touches one of these juvenile thugs some lawyer will yell police brutality," one woman wrote angrily.

Another man wrote, "We should judge different crimes on their merits in the courts, either guilty or not guilty, and quit the petty practice of freeing a criminal because some form was written in blue ink when it should have been black—another lawyer joke."

One Hyde Park woman cited five separate incidents of violence which she and her family had either seen or been involved in in less than a year. These included prowlers at the home, a child beaten up in a school washroom and another child the woman saw being beaten by an older man who had made homosexual advances to the child.

"The case (against the older man) was heard, and he admitted to the charge of contributing to the delinquency of a minor," the woman said. "The end result?" He was walking the streets 'on probation' the next day. You wonder why you see defeat in the officer's eyes? I don't. Check this man's (the child molester) record. It reads like 'who's going to commit the next mass murder.'"

"Let's put some laws in that protect this city," she said. "Make the laws tough. And use them to their full advantage. Or shall we carry our own guns? I say no. We should double the action all the way—double the police force, double their pay, double the laws. Do whatever is necessary to protect the innocent and that includes police officers."

VIETNAM CONFERENCE IN MANILA

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, our president—and the leaders of other governments lending military and economic support to the Vietnamese people—will soon be meeting in the Philippines.

We all look forward, I am sure, to the results of that Conference. And we wish the participants well.

In this connection, I noted with interest the results yesterday by Senator JAVITS, of New York. He said some nice things about the coming Conference.

Then, he said that he hoped it would produce more than the meeting of American and Vietnamese leaders at Honolulu in February.

I am puzzled by the Senator's remarks.

I wonder if he has looked at the record.

I wonder if he has compared the promises of the Honolulu Conference with the performance of the Americans and the Vietnamese in the short time since that meeting.

I commend to his reading the 44-page report on Vietnamese development prepared for the President by Robert Komer, his special assistant for nonmilitary programs in Vietnam.

Honolulu held out the promise of progress on the political front.

The result: an election law was written; elections were held—in which more than 80 percent of the registered voters cast ballots; and an Assembly to write a constitution is already meeting in Saigon.

The Government of Vietnam made a promise. And it kept that promise.

Steps to combat inflation were promised at Honolulu.

The Government of Vietnam devalued its currency by 50 percent.

Taxes were raised.

Port congestion was cut—and the volume of imports doubled.

The cost-of-living index has stopped rising—and the money supply in circulation has dropped.

A promise was made—and kept.

New efforts to bring the Vietcong to the Government side were made at Honolulu.

As a result, more than 12,000 Vietcong had moved to the Government side—and are being cared for. More surrendered in 7 months than in all of 1965.

So action followed promise.

Special help to rural areas was promised.

Electric power has begun to flow to the homes of 144,000 Vietnamese farmers. New credit arrangements have been made. The supply of fertilizers and tools has increased.

Another promise—and more performance.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, with the pledges of Honolulu and the performance record of the few intervening months.

Let me say merely that it is not just a good record—it is an amazing record.

If the Philippines meeting next month produces as much—we and the Vietnamese and all free men can be grateful.

VIETNAM

(Mr. RESNICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, Monday night, during a debate in Hudson, N.Y., my Republican opponent, Hamilton Fish, Jr., to the surprise of everyone, proposed that the President of the United States make a pilgrimage to France to enlist the aid of President Charles de Gaulle as a mediator in the Vietnam conflict.

He further stated that the United States should "stop doing things to irritate De Gaulle," whom he considered of stature equal to Winston Churchill, Konrad Adenauer and President Eisenhower.

I am thoroughly appalled by this suggestion to rely upon President de Gaulle, of all people, for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. I consider President de Gaulle to be thoroughly unqualified to mediate the peaceful settlement of anything, anywhere in the world.

Since he became President of France in 1958 that country has followed a foreign policy, conceived and directed by De Gaulle, that has been consistently anti-American, anti-British, and anti-Common Market. He has personally attempted to move France away from her Western allies into a position of independence. This policy has resulted in the French refusal to admit Britain to the European Common Market. And it has resulted in the disruption of progress by the Common Market on virtually everything.

In addition, De Gaulle has wrecked NATO by removing his troops and refusing to have NATO troops or headquarters on French soil. He has also refused to pay the French share of expenses for peacekeeping operations in the Congo and elsewhere because he felt that keeping peace in these areas was not in the best interest of France. Are these the actions of a man of peace? Is this the kind of a man who can mediate a peaceful settlement in Vietnam?

What is even more dangerous for the longrun peace of the world is President de Gaulle's belligerent attitude toward the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1962 and his flat refusal to sign that treaty. Red China is the only other power that has refused to sign this, the first encouraging step toward controlling nuclear weapons and their proliferation that the world has seen.

In addition to the incredible credentials, De Gaulle has methodically sought to weaken the friendly relations that have existed between the United States and France since the days of LaFayette. Why, more American dead lie buried under French soil than are buried anywhere else in the world. He has attempted to wreck this friendship through his consistently hostile anti-American statements. Further, by demanding gold in return for dollars, he has reduced U.S. reserves of gold and weakened confidence in the stability and value of the dollars.

Perhaps, the most telling criticism however, is the record of French actions in southeast Asia. For years the French attempted to hold onto their colonies while more foresighted nations like Britain were building a civil service and training local people in the methods of democratic government. France did none of this. After this deplorable performance and after losing a war in southeast Asia, President de Gaulle gratuitously suggested in Cambodia just 2 weeks ago that the United States should simply get out of Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fish's suggestion leaves me aghast. If there is any one man who is least qualified to mediate the peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war it is Charles de Gaulle. Can any responsible candidate for the office of U.S. Congressman in good faith make such a dangerous suggestion?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished minority leader, Mr. Ford, if this suggestion is something that Hamilton Fish, Jr., dreamed up all by himself, or if this is the official policy of the Republican Party?

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have general leave to revise and extend their remarks during the debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 303 I am recorded as not voting.